

PATENT
450108-4484**REMARKS**

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 162 and 163 are in the present application. It is submitted that the claims, as originally presented, were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. Claims 149-152 and 159-161 are canceled.

Claims 149-152 and 159-163 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klingler et al. (U.S. Patent 5,682,326) in view of Amiot et al. (U.S. Patent 5,781,188).

The present claims specifically recite "said table including at least automatically generated textual indicia identifying said plurality of clips as being material clips or resultant clips including those clips subjected to said processing to produce said first resultant clip, and said indicia indicating the modules used to process said clips." (Claim 162; Claim 163 contains a similar limitation) This automatic generation of the indicia is supported in the specification at page 74, line 21 to page 75, line 19.

PATENT
450108-4484

As noted by the Examiner, "Klingler still does not clearly show that the table having the textual indicia which is automatically generated to identify the plurality of clips." (Office Action page 4) Rather to meet the present invention's "automatically generated textual indicia" limitation, the Examiner asserts "Amiot clearly teaches the RESULT track (the resultant clip) is a combination of the original clips (the material clips), TRACK 1-5 of fig. 3 (e.g., col. 7 lines 4-18 and fig. 3)." (Office Action page 5)

Amiot's Figure 3 "illustrates a timeline window that includes a result track and up to five component tracks." However, Amiot's timeline window is analogous to the present invention's timeline window 34 shown in Figure 10; rather than the present invention's "table including at least automatically generated textual indicia" shown in Figure 13. Amiot's timeline window shows a graphical representation of the clips, whereas the present claims require text representing how the clips are edited together. Moreover, Amiot's graphics do not detail the specific steps performed in editing the clips; which is the purpose of the present invention's textual indicia. Hence, Amiot's timeline window fails to meet the present invention's "automatically generated textual indicia" as recited in the present claims.

Accordingly, Applicants maintain their previous argument that while it is theoretically possible for an editor to manually enter comments similar to the present invention's indicia, it is not a practical solution because of the complexity and time involved in tracking and updating all of the processing information. Not only does the present invention automatically generate and display the indicia, but the indicia also provides an entire shorthand system for tracking the processing performed on various clips. For example, neither Klingler nor Amiot discloses any predefined system of codes, symbols, text, indicators, etc... for "identifying said plurality of clips as being material clips or resultant clips." In fact, Klingler and Amiot both fail to mention

PATENT
450108-4484

any of the benefits provided by the present indicia in the context of their disclosures. Hence, the present invention's indicia limitations are not obvious in view of Klingler or Amiot.

Therefore, for at least this reason, Klingler and Amiot fails to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.


In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Darren M. Simon
Reg. No. 47,946
(212) 588-0800

BEST AVAILABLE COPY